

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-16, 18-25, 40-41, 43-50, 55-56 and 58-65 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-14, 17, 26-39, 42, 51-54 and 57 were canceled. Claims 15-16, 18, 20, 23-25, 40-41, 43-45, 48-50, 55-56, 58, 60 and 63-65 were amended. No claims were added. Applicant has carefully considered the cited art and the Examiner's comments, and believes the claims currently in the case patentably distinguish over the cited art and are allowable in their present form. Reconsideration of the rejection is, accordingly, respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-25, 40-50 and 55-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Nielsen*, U.S. Patent No. 5,875,443. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states, in part:

Regarding independent claim 15, Nielsen discloses scanning a data stream and detecting a word that does not match any of the words in a dictionary (column 3, lines 15-50 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that a user may indicate that, regardless of not detecting the word, it is correctly spelled and add it to a dictionary (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Nielsen discloses that the user is presented with the option of adding it to any of the user's dictionaries (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen). Once the user selects the dictionary to add the term to that dictionary is updated with the new term (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Nielsen discloses that a database contains multiple dictionaries that are broken down into organizational units (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen). The determination of which dictionaries to update on the server is determined based on these organizational units (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen).

Office Action dated September 21, 2006, pages 3-4.

Claim 15 as amended herein is as follows:

15. A method for updating a plurality of dictionaries or glossaries stored within a data processing system, wherein the data processing system includes an organizational database comprising information for organizational units within the data processing system, wherein each dictionary or glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries is a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, and wherein each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with an organizational unit, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

automatically scanning a datastream;
automatically detecting, in the datastream, a word that does not match an indexed term or word in a dictionary or a glossary; and
responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term.

A prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in that single prior art reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of a claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Nielsen* does not identically show every element of the claimed invention arranged as they are in the claims; and, accordingly, does not anticipate the claims. With respect to claim 1, in particular, *Nielsen* does not teach or suggest a data processing system that includes “an organizational database comprising information for organizational units within the data processing system, wherein each dictionary or glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries is a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, and wherein each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with an organizational unit”, and also does not disclose or suggest “responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term”.

Nielsen is directed to techniques for updating network-based dictionaries to add new words based on information provided by users. The Examiner refers generally to column 3, line 30 to column 4, line 11 of *Nielsen* as disclosing the subject matter of the claims. Column 3, line 30 to column 4, line 11 of *Nielsen* is reproduced below for the convenience of the Examiner:

The dictionary is furnished to users by a vendor, who may also be the vendor of the word processor and spelling checker application programs. Each client computer runs a word processing application with a spelling checker routine that references a database in local memory including a main dictionary and one or more custom dictionaries, similar to existing word processing systems such as the FRAME MAKER.RTM. program described above. For each language supported by the vendor, the vendor computer

memory contains a dictionary of approved words which is periodically released to individual users. Thus, each user's main dictionary corresponds to a released version of an approved dictionary from the vendor. When a user checks the spelling in a document and wishes to add a word to his local custom dictionary, the spelling checker provides the user with the option of communicating with the vendor to add the new word to the approved dictionaries in the vendor computer. In other words, each time users add new entries to their local custom dictionaries, they are given the opportunity to request the addition of these entries also to the vendor's global approved dictionaries (one for each supported language).

In a preferred embodiment, when the vendor computer receives an Internet message from a client computer suggesting the addition of a new word to the global dictionary, the vendor computer first checks to see if the language of the word is supported, and if so, then the computer further determines whether the word is already in the approved dictionary for that language. If the approved dictionary already contains the word, this is an indication that the user's main dictionary is outdated and the vendor computer sends an Internet message to the client computer relaying this fact and providing information about the availability and cost of a new upgrade for the local main dictionary. Periodically this information is displayed to the user, and the user is given the opportunity to upgrade the local main dictionary.

If the proposed new word is not found in the vendor dictionary of approved words, the vendor computer then checks whether the word is in a second dictionary of known misspellings of words in the corresponding language. This second dictionary is another database in the memory of the vendor computer, containing the aggregation of known misspellings together with suggested correct spellings for each misspelled word. If the proposed new word is found in this second dictionary, then the vendor computer conveys an Internet message to the client computer informing the user of the misspelling, together with the suggested correct spellings. This gives the user the opportunity to remove the misspelled word from the user's local custom dictionary.

The above recitation describes a mechanism by which, when a user determines that a new entry should be added to his local dictionary, he is given the opportunity to request addition of the entry also to the vendor's global approved dictionaries, of which there is one for each language supported by the vendor. In *Nielsen*, each vendor dictionary is for a vendor supported language. *Nielsen* does not disclose or suggest, in the above recitation or elsewhere, a data processing system that includes an organizational database comprising information for organizational units within the data processing system, wherein each dictionary or glossary of the plurality of dictionaries or glossaries is a member of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, and wherein each dictionary or glossary in the hierarchical set of dictionaries or glossaries is associated with an organizational unit, and also does not disclose or suggest "responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term" as specified in claim 15. *Nielsen* does not disclose a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries, and does not disclose or suggest that each dictionary or glossary in a hierarchical set be associated with an

organizational unit within the database. *Nielsen* discloses a plurality of dictionaries in different vendor supported languages, but does not disclose dictionaries arranged in a hierarchical manner and are associated with organizational units.

As described in the present application, by organizing dictionaries or glossaries in a hierarchical manner in association with organizational units, a user can easily select a group of dictionaries and/or glossaries to be updated as a function of an organizational unit. For example, as shown in Figure 9 of the present application, dictionaries and/or glossaries can be updated based on whether the dictionaries and/or glossaries are at a corporate level, a department level or a user level. *Nielsen* does not disclose or suggest such a capability and does not disclose or suggest “responsive to an indication that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining, with reference to the organizational database, a list of dictionaries and/or glossaries in the hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries or glossaries to be updated with the new term” as recited in claim 15.

Claim 15, accordingly, is not anticipated by *Nielsen* and patentably distinguishes over *Nielsen* in its present form.

Claims 16 and 18-25 depend from and further restrict claim 15, and are also not anticipated by *Nielsen*, at least by virtue of their dependency. Many of these claims, however, recite additional subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by *Nielsen*. For example, claim 18 recites that “responsive to a determination of a user that indicated that the unmatched word is a properly spelled new term, determining the organizational unit containing the user”, and “selecting a set of dictionaries and/or glossaries based on the organizational unit for the user”.

As discussed above, *Nielsen* does not disclose or suggest selecting dictionaries or glossaries to be updated based on an organizational unit, and also does not disclose “selecting a set of dictionaries and/or glossaries based on the organizational unit for the user”. Claim 18, accordingly, patentably distinguishes over *Nielsen* in its own right as well as by virtue of its dependency.

Independent claims 40 and 55 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 15 and are not anticipated by *Nielsen* for similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 15. Claims 41, 43-50, 56 and 58-65 depend from and further restrict one of claims 40 and 55 and are also not anticipated by *Nielsen*.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 15-25, 40-50 and 55-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

Furthermore, *Nielsen* does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. *Nielsen* actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention because it is directed to updating dictionaries in different vendor supported languages as opposed to updating dictionaries and/or glossaries that are in a hierarchically ordered set with reference to an organizational unit database as in the presently claimed invention. Absent the Examiner pointing out some teaching or incentive to implement *Nielsen* to update dictionaries and/or glossaries that are in a hierarchically ordered set with reference to an organizational unit database, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to modify *Nielsen* to reach the present invention when the reference is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive to modify *Nielsen* in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an improper use of hindsight using the Applicant's disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

II. Conclusion

For at least all the above reasons, it is respectfully urged that claims 15-16, 18-25, 40-41, 43-50, 55-56 and 58-65 are patentable over *Nielsen* and that this application is now in condition for allowance. It is, accordingly, respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: December 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald H. Glanzman/

Gerald H. Glanzman
Reg. No. 25,035
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicant